

CRDSP MEETING MINUTES
Carson City, Nevada
Tuesday, 22 April 2008
8:30 am - 4:30 pm

Attendees:

Peter Ainsworth	BLM Utah SO/Salt Lake FO		
Eric Allison	California OHP	916 653- 7278	ealli@parks.ca.gov
Sandra Arnold	BLM Yuma FO (AZ)	928 317- 3239	Sandra_Arnold@blm.gov
Chris Arthur	BLM Casper FO (WY)	307 261- 7501	Chris_Arthur@blm.gov
Tom Burke (attended Day One)	BLM NVSO	775 861- 6415	tlburke@nv.blm.gov
Chris Cook	BLM, Battle Mountain, NV		
Donna Day (attended Day One)	FS Heritage Business Team	530 478- 6214	dday@fs.fed.us
Karyn de Dufour	Nevada SHPO	775 684- 3447	kmdedufo@clan.lib.nv.us
Bill Doleman	New Mexico SHPO	505 776- 1277	billdoleman@state.nv.us
Scott Goodman	Oregon, Cultural Data Steward	541 416- 6760	hgoodman@or.blm.gov
Kirk Halford	BLM WO and BLM Bishop FO (CA)	760 872- 5030	khalford@ca.blm.gov
Bill Hedman	BLM Central Yukon FO (AK)	907 267- 1293	whedman@blm.gov
Mary Hopkins	Wyoming SHPO	307 766- 5324	Hopkins@uwyo.edu
Eric Ingbar	Gnomon, Inc.	775 885- 2305 x201	eingbar@gnomon.com
Kristen Jensen	Utah SHPO	801 533- 3526	kjensen@utah.gov
Rick Karl	Arizona, AZSITE		
Glenda King	Idaho SHPO	208 334- 3847	Glenda.King@ishs.idaho.gov
John Knoerl (attended Day One)	NPS, CRGIS		
Arie Leeflang	Utah SHPO		
Dan Martin	WO BLM		

Deidre McCarthy (attended Day One)	NPS, CRGIS	202 352- 2141	Deidre_Mccarthy@nps.gov
Damon Murdo	Montana SHPO		
Jason Strahl	BLM Dillon FO (MT)	406 683- 8033	Jason_Strahl@blm.gov
Mary Sullivan	Colorado SHPO		

DAY ONE

Introductions

Welcome to everyone from Kirk Halford and introduction of Alice Baldrica.

Welcome to Nevada from Deputy SHPO for Nevada, Alice Baldrica

- Welcome to Nevada!! It's a valuable partnership - glad to see the Forest Service represented - we want your data too!!

Housekeeping

Nevada SHPO Data Manager, Karyn de Dufour

Introductions (continued)

Welcome to the most beautiful state in the nation from Tom Burke, Nevada BLM

- Thinking of the theme, 10 yrs after, the Tom views the CRDS Partnership like a marriage...a process of continually revisiting your priorities and your commitments, not always easy or fun... In Nevada in particular, we're glad to have Karyn de Dufour and Chris Cook on board as well as having Eric Ingbar's and Kirk Halford's commitment in seeing the partnership move forward. It is an unwieldy animal to pull all the BLM and SHPO offices together.

Welcome from Kirk Halford, CRDSP BLM Coordinator

- Last year the two themes were “ground up” and “engage”
- This year proposed themes are
 - data in/data out
 - communications
 - problem-solving and solutions

Discussion of the Purpose of the CRDSP Meeting (various topics noted)

- Much of the meeting will be focused on the BLM and SHPO surveys that were completed and compiled. The information received was/is very valuable and a lot was learned.

- Inroads towards better communications are starting already - getting word out to field offices about what the CRDSP is, what it's for, etc.

Point: *CRDSP Coordinator is a full-time position*

- Emails can be sent to the division chief of WO240 or write to the director Jim Caswell and let him know what an important issue this really is.

Group Comments:

Mary Hopkins (Wyoming): BLM feels like they are bearing the lion's share of the funding? Have you heard that? posed to Kirk.

Kirk Halford: BLM funding subactivities may not understand the amount of investment that goes into data-sharing from the SHPO and other partners.

We've got a lot to do, but getting those data representatives involved is going to be a big part of it.

Agenda Item Presentation:

Conference Call with Beckki Lassel (Washington Office), 9 am

Point: *Budgeting Levels for 2009 and 2010*

Bekki: CRDSP has the same level as 2008 - 350,000K.

She and Kirk want to continue to have Kirk's presence in Washington

- She has been unable to secure any additional funding - but she's still trying - the next effort is for 2010 - she will ask for additional funding
- *Grant Science Program:* One possibility for funding is through the science grant program for ocs?? **not sure of acronym**. This program has 150,000K that goes through the science grant program. She knows that they aren't spending out the money in 2008 and that grant submissions are available until 25 April 2008. She assumes that you can still get money for 2009 through April 2009
- The NLCS - has 5k-25K awards, with most awards at 10K - but there is no existing dollar cap for an award. In 2008, there were 15-20 awards. Main award areas: basic understanding (baseline inventories, objective driven monitoring, etc.) applied science (implement physical or social science....) addressing other research questions....
- She thinks there are eligible needs from within the CRDSP - so perhaps another source for funding. An organization would have to write for that money. Not awarded to for-profit entities. Organization would have to already be in Grants.gov.
- She wants to get on the schedule for 2009.

- Get an example of this from Becky - Science coordinator - if we could identify the percentage of impact of the database on NLCS - then perhaps some funding could come of it.
 - Becky and Kirk will work together to get a packet together - there is something come out about it.
- They tacked on an application fee for APDs - Becky doesn't think there is an opportunity there for 2009. She got dodged so we missed the 2009, but she will still pursue it for 2010.

Point: *General atmosphere and feelings back in Washington?*

- *Bekki:* 2010 is going to be a rough year - new administration - other factors. Generally BLM will be hit with a pretty substantial decrease. As they move forward into hard budget years the programs will look for cost inefficiencies - she thinks CRDSP will see some heavy decreases in reference to the current level - Washington feels it's based on just maintenance or basic data entry. Rather than paying for backlog, they want to see that everything is working fine and then when they see that they will want their money back. CRDSP will need to come up with justifications -
- *Kirk:* Thinking about going out to Washington in Fall 2008 to discuss with them the added value of what the CRDSP is doing. Has tried to convey that there is no end to the data management process - it is in perpetuity - there is no sunset date on the partnership initiative. As long as there are "undertakings" there is a need for data management.

Summary: (*Bekki*) We need to think outside of the box to continue to fund CRDSP at its current level - any ideas give *Bekki* or *Kirk* a call.

Group Comments:

Mary H (Wyoming): There's six million dollars in Preserve America grants. The BLM or Park Service are not eligible for this funding. It's all just sitting there - SAT grants and Preserve American are non-partisan...

Karyn de Dufour (Nevada): You might not be able to get big dollars (in Preserve America funding) but small pots of money are available

Karyn de Dufour (Nevada): There is an initiative whereby several states get together and apply separately for funding, but the purpose of the application is data sharing across state lines - perhaps a process can be worked out to apply with the same themes as other states, somewhat of a western wide data sharing initiative.

Agenda Item Presentation:
INFRA Heritage, Donna Day, Forest Service Infra Heritage

Powerpoint presentation

New things:

1. Heritage reporting (an answer to federal/state auditing requirements)
 2. Collections documentation (called assemblages) - does not track individual objects, tracks groups of objects, documents, maps and images
 3. GIS
 4. Data Exchange
 - Once data are captured in I-web, then the data can be shared with SHPOs and other partners. There is a data exchange model.
 - Several other states have expressed interest.
 - Data exchange schedules can be worked out - doesn't always have to be a manual process.
-

Agenda Item Presentation:
Role of the Data Representative, Chris Cook, BLM Data Steward

- We need a data rep - how do we fund it? How do we find time to do it? How can we make it a reality?
 - Lead by Example: Start with your own District's Cultural Program -- convert the legacy database, devise operating procedures to facilitate the digital process and be the first adopter.
 - Advocate! Impress and support them in how this will work for them, get them to buy into it.
 - Provide education to the staff.
 - Data rep needs to forge close relationships with SHPO and technical advisors.
-

Agenda Item Presentation:
Data In-Data Out, Existing Success Stories, Rick Karl, AZSITE and Sandra Arnold, BLM Archaeologist

- Data is scattered all over state - agencies didn't want to share
- Finally got the data (four core agencies + the BLM) to the web
- Currently, 5 web pages are running the whole system
- They have no stateline budget to run it at all - everything is fee based and small grants for additional funding
- Main AZSITE webpage - there is a user app available - (users must adhere to Dept of the Interior standards and/or be permitted in Arizona - basically, if SHPO approves the user, then they can use the application.

- User can enter partial data in a query and get a response - lots of data on the site that is able to be queried such as, NR status, location, last visited details, general remarks, etc.
- There is also a map application - based on ArcIMS / SDE background. A query can define project area and sites returns within the area - data returned from a query is exportable to excel.
 - He provides regular clips to the BLM.
- Current records search results are a shapefile and attribute data - Rick's office fields about 3 record searches a day, 365 days a year.
 - It costs \$75.00 a search within a six quad area.
- There is a standalone entry model - built on MS Access -
- Rick has spent countless hours with BLM and various other agencies on training the folks in these entities. He believes this is KEY to the success of AZSITE.
- AZSITE will be matching up into INFRA soon - they are somewhat up to date with legacy data
 - In 2007, there were 2000 new projects, 1100 new sites - these are still sitting on boxes
 - Currently working on data submitted in 2005
 -
- Sandra Arnold: BLM 10 yr assessment -
 - Field office archaeologists were almost 100% supportive
 - BLM folks collect data with GPS - and most are fairly competent.
 - BLM has a somewhat problem with legacy data - field offices just don't have resources to get it into the system -- Grad students at AZSITE might be able to help.
- Data is definitely going in - data out (BLM's ability to clip data from AZSITE) is coming soon
- Key to success is Communication!!!

Agenda Item Presentation:

NPS Initiative to Develop National Data Standards/FGDC Process -- The Need for Cultural Resource Data Standards, John Knoerl, Program Manager, CRGIS, Heritage Documentation Programs, National Park Service and Deidre McCarthy Architectural Historian, CRGIS, Heritage Documentation Programs, National Park Service

- There is a need for cultural resource spatial data standards - a need to begin to understand and share data
 - They agree with almost every element of what is already existing... 'where there are not direct parallels in fields, the draft NPS standards have expanded on the same concepts with potentially more robust counterparts'
- Standards being proposed will allow you to link to attribute tables.
 - Use location to link everyone's table
 - Feature level metadata standards
- Overall, it should address the following:

- Feature level metadata
 - Geospatial representation
 - Linking of geospatial data to exterior attributes
- The main purposes of the standards are:
- keep people from replicating the same data over and over
 - advocate data sharing.
- The standards are now in the Project Stage - 3 yr timeframe for this -- this allows for a lot of time to develop consensus.
- Define funding sources
 - Create methodology
 - Define who's going to do what
- in the next stage, Draft Stage, is when you actually begin creating the standards.

Going forward:

- This project will cost about 250K - funding for this will be developed in the project stage
- The workgroup will probably meet in DC because that's where the subcommittee is.
- One workshop east coast and one west.
 - Looking to other federal agencies to help with funding
- Contact info: john_knoerl@nps.gov and deidre_mccarthy@nps.gov

Agenda Item Presentation:

Permitting Standards, Kirk Halford, CRDSP Coordinator

- Discussion of 'How California Does It'
- Contractors don't read them - in general
- Presentation focused on Stipulations M, N, & O
- For collecting data with a GPS, BLM has required standards - for example, a Garmin Sport Utility Unit will even meet those standards
- FGDC will require a higher level of accuracy
- It's a work in progress....
- starting to get x y data from people is beginning to move it down the path...

Agenda Item Presentation:

Procedural Guidance for Access and Transmittal of Electronic Records and Spatial Information. Breaking Down the Barriers of Ownership..., Karyn de Dufour, Nevada SHPO, Kristen Jensen, Utah SHPO

- They performed a quick survey of the CRDSP attendees -- 16 people strongly disagree that records does not equal land access.
 - All strongly agreed -- 14 of 17 -- that a data sharing agreement should be in place.
 - 14 people agree that SHPOs are the hub for various land managing agencies
 - Maybe ownership is the wrong word - services are a more appropriate word - what do we agree on?
- SHPOs are the central hub for services - regardless of who owns the data -

Karyn D: Who controls access to the data?

Mary H: I use the park service bulletin - it's no longer on park service website - it was originally written by John Knoerl. If the person meets Secretary of Interior standards...

Bill D: In New Mexico there are state laws for protection - there is a grey zone within this...

Chris Cook: BLM 1030 standards - they need to given enough information to make an assessment...

Karyn D: NVCRIS users group - BLM, SHPO, land managing agencies, policy created from this...

Chris Cook: A policy guideline put out by the CRDSP - include regulatory aspects and the thoughts of the members of the CRDSP.

Kirk: We have to do the best we can to ensure the right people have the right information - are we making it difficult for folks to access data?

Eric Ingbar: Recommendation of the group - every state or partnership should come up with a set of classes of access and those should be made public...

Mary H: We could share our user agreements.

Karyn D: And a copy of the standard data-sharing agreement.

Tom B: Here in Nevada it includes paper and electronic data.

Rick: AZSITE is just electronic data.

Mary H: Monitoring mis-use is another big ball of wax, ex: people sharing passwords, etc.

Kristen: Can we compile everything and put it all together - but not post it yet - maybe have another forum to discuss it.

Kirk: It's valuable to have an overarching statement that covers all the states and how we perceive this issue - we can all come to a general consensus.

Mary H: The public does deserve to know what money is being spent and how and what protection measures are in place.

ACTION ITEM FOR KIRK: Follow up on the above discussion and summarize.

Agenda Item Presentation:

Cultural Fire Issues Coordination, Dan Martin, BLM Washington Office

- To me, land and resource management = GIS because everything has a spatial dimension
- Forums provide a great opportunity for training and face-face discussion
- We need to be involved in the fire community

Group Comments

Chris Arthur: Made maps that are color-coded so if there is a fire it can be referenced at dispatch and then reps from each of the affected areas are called in.

Tom Burke: Nevada has something similar - Resource Advisor Kits
Also, with Gnomon, BLM has modelled parts of Nevada to high, medium low sensitivity and survey coverage to help out in this regard.

Chris Arthur: The easiest way is to assign an archaeologist to the fire line.

Donna Day: Shift plans are written 12-24 hour in advance - so you need to be a part of the planning phase as well.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30ish

DAY TWO, Wednesday, 23 April 2008

Agenda Item Presentation:

What California Has In Terms of GIS, Kirk Halford, CRDSP Coordinator

Powerpoint presentation giving a visual overview of what the California BLM GIS system looks like.

Group Comments

Mary H: You want to make sure you are representing the quality AND the content of the data in the GIS.

Mary H: Sometimes the BLM changes something on their computers (internal IT) and no one tells the SHPOs and then the field office folks feel as if it doesn't work.

Rick: An example, recently Arizona field offices changed something, but they contacted him right away so they worked together to sort out the problem, in conjunction with the BLM IT people.

Sandra: The important thing was figuring out who to speak with.

Dan Martin: I can help! I can fight battles for you - very important to work with local office folks - but talk to the national end as well - give him (Dan) something to work with and he can try and address the issues in Washington.

Kirk then displayed an attribute form that contains metadata standards, another form (tab) shows site info - apps like this can help to ensure standardization.

Kirk & Mary H: QC is an issue because there isn't the staff to do it - no time to go back and fix errors in the GIS.

Chris Cook, Eric Ingbar, Mary H: Include some kind of cross-checking that stops you from entering erroneous data...something that's enforceable.

Rick: You need to make them aware that there is an error - sometimes the person entering doesn't even know that they've made an error.

BLM should have access as and when without a problem.
There are a lot of complaints regarding IT policies and standards throughout the BLM and that then affects the transfer of data.

Mary H: Park Service mcshpo ([I don't know what she said here](#))?? Hiring a consultant to come up with best practices is getting tremendous attention in DC, because it was an independent review of preservation and digitization is pretty far behind - although many states have been pretty proactive.

Agenda Item Presentation:

State of the States Survey, Kirk Halford, CRDSP Coordinator and Eric Ingbar, Consultant/Contractor

Powerpoint presentation giving an overview of the completed BLM and SHPO surveys.

Summary: Surveys show that generic concerns are the same - these topics will be addressed in further detail during the break out groups. (All states will receive two copies of their respective SHPO and BLM surveys for review).

Key Points:

- 1) **Communication** seems to be a key factor in states with perceived/real problem(s)
 - Data Representative and SHPO Data Manager are key individuals
 - Time they spend communicating helps all
 - Each needs the trust of their agency
 - Communication to the Field is critical
- 2) **Training** at FO Level is a Key Need and a form of Communication
- 3) **Data Currency:** Keeping data current is very important
 - Out of date or perceived inaccurate information is #1 cause of dissatisfaction and lack of use of SHPO data
 - Mechanisms for reporting problems are not always clear
 - Data In/Data Out: Greatest successes seem to be where shared data system “takes in” BLM information routinely and is accessible with little lag time

Next Steps:

- SHPO and BLM develop a work plan to address the survey results in each State. May include:
 - Forums for Communication
 - Education
 - Training
 - System Development
 - Data Development

Agenda Item Presentation:

Strategies to Address Common Themes, Kirk Halford, CRDSP Coordinator and Eric Ingbar, Consultant/Contractor

Break out groups

Separate SHPO and BLM Forums on 2, 5, and 10 year goals, Break up in to functional outcomes for:

Technical outcome
Support outcomes

Training outcome

SUMMARY OF BREAKOUT GROUP RESULTS, facilitated by Kirk Halford (BLM Group) and Eric Ingbar (SHPO Group)

OUTCOMES:

BLM

- BLM recognizes that it is just one constituent that SHPOs serve (though an important one).
- The BLM and SHPO will continue to have a cordial, professional, relationship. The candor that has characterized the relationship to date should continue with appropriate, respectful, communication.
- We should, and will, always strive to have *more* communication, not less. Thus, we will always seek new opportunities and means to share information, ideas, and plans. This may include shared web sites and forums, frequent teleconferences and on-line meetings, and face to face meetings of all, or some, members of the partnership.
- Make a list of where problems with IT are occurring (within BLM) and in the BLM-SHPO shared systems.
- DPOs will recognize the Data Representative status as authoritative within the data-sharing arena. This is especially critical in the IT area - IT staff need to know, perhaps from the DPO, that the Data Representative's concerns and comments represent the cultural resource staff needs within the state. Where necessary, the DPO may attend meetings, etc., to assist the Data Representative.
- Training - fundamentals of database management. Establish a basic training class on how databases work (spatial and tabular).

SHPOs

2 Year Goals:

1. SHPOs will assess the funding provided by BLM as a percentage of their total data management cost.

Purpose: Show how BLM dollars are amply matched by SHPO and other agency funds.

2. SHPOs will have a means within their states to assess time and cost savings achieved by shared digital data compared to earlier, paper-based, systems.

Purpose: Prove that shared data systems are saving public dollars.

3. Each state will have some basic training curriculum for their data-sharing (electronic) systems.

Purpose: The shared data system will have training mechanisms in place for professionals who are new to the state.

4. Each state will have some basic, state-specific, training in legal requirements of cultural resource management (federal and state requirements).

Purpose: This is mainly directed towards contracting professionals who are not always abreast of permit and legal requirements. In addition to technical training, professionals in each state are exposed to the underlying legal and procedural reasons they have jobs!

5. An annual work plan regarding data sharing and partnership activities within the state will be created by the SHPO and Data Representative with input from the FOs. The annual plan will be circulated by a pre-determined date and discussed at statewide protocol meetings (of the BLM) with the SHPO Data Manager present too.

Purpose: Involve all parties in data sharing planning and priority discussions.

6. Identify a target lag time between information being generated or gathered to its presence as data in the shared system.

Purpose: Establish appropriate timeframes (even if they cannot yet be achieved).

7. SHPOs, internally, will involve data managers in discussions about protocols, agreements, etc., so that data management considerations can be included in such documents.

5 Year Goals:

1. Full Population of Data System with legacy data (no backlog)

Purpose: Set a timeline for full population. Highest value goal.

2. Each state will have a means (though perhaps not mandatory) to submit basic information categories (resource records, inventory records) electronically. The means may be on-line, PDA-based, satellite applications, etc., but will convey data electronically.

Purpose: "Born-digital"

3. All state protocols include data-sharing terms.

Purpose: Currently, the nPA and the state PAs all incorporate data-sharing. This goal is simply to continually lock-in the importance of data-sharing and the partnership by making it part of mandatory business process.

4. Each state will identify a target lag time for typical activities and a plan for achieving the target.

Purpose: No new backlog. Also users of shared system know how current data in the system will be because a standard is in place.